

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1-9 have been rejected. Claims 10-18 have been withdrawn.

Rejection under § 102 or § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 “under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Williams.” Applicant traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Under both § 102 and § 103, the references must teach all of the elements of Applicant’s claimed invention. Applicant’s claims 1-9 each require acrylic emulsions in the composition. At paragraph 21 in Applicant’s specification, acrylic emulsions are enumerated. Acrylic emulsions must be emulsions. The Examiner points to certain paragraphs of Williams to teach “wax, ethylene chloride copolymer acrylic copolymer, and styrenated acrylic copolymer.” Copolymers are not necessarily present in emulsions. Williams even notes that in the adhesive layer referenced by the Examiner, there are “component dispersions,” not emulsions. *See Williams*, paragraph 0060. Williams does not teach acrylic emulsions, which are required by each of Applicant’s claims 1-9. Therefore, Williams is not an anticipatory reference and no case of prima facie obviousness has been made, and the rejections should be removed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests consideration and allowance of the amended and newly added claims. Finally, Applicant respectfully submits a request for a personal interview with the Examiner, in order to further resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Nanda P.B.A. Kumar
Registration No. 44,853
Matyellen Feehery
Registration No. 44,677
Reed Smith LLP
Intellectual Property
P.O. Box 7990
Philadelphia, PA 19101-7990
(215) 851-8100
Attorneys for Applicant